/84 cont./

396 The construction of these rafts is rather simple, although
[147] it demands great manual skill and considerable expenditure of strength. The keel is composed of two enormous spindle-shaped sheafs of totora tied together. The natives obtain them by heaping up and intertwining stalks of totora of unequal length (Pl. IV, B /see p. 24/); they take care that the shortest remain inside and they cover these with progressively longer stalks until the total forms a compact mass. The rope which maintains each of these rolls /85/ /Fig. 25 appears here/ /86/ is crossed at each turn with that of the other sheaf. Two padded rims are then fastened to the edge, where they serve as a railing and add to the stability of the craft. The only instrument to which the Indians have recourse in making these rafts is a wooden hook (Fig. 24, 5 /see p. 10/), which they use to lift the straw rope, either to tighten it or to pass the rope which joins one sheaf to the other under it. This alternating play of the ropes obliges the balsa constructors to work always two by
501 two (Pl. IV, C /see p. 24/). For navigating, the Uro have long boathooks, t'okena, the wood for which comes from the eastern slopes of the Andes. The extremity of these poles ends in a sort of trident which prevents them from sinking too deeply in the mud of the lake (Fig. 25, 2 /see p. 15/).

285 Mats. The Uro Indians have several uses for the rush (totora) mats. They make the framework and roofs of their huts from it, their beds, the door of their house, and the sails of their balsas. Making them is not complicated. The totora stalks are spread out on five or six parallel ropes, stretched between stakes, and attached to them in little piles.

283 Rope-making. The Uro are obliged to constantly make rope, the indispensable accessory for the two industries which have just been mentioned. Different types of gramineous plants,
[124] among them the Stipa ichu Kunth, Festucha orthophylla Pilger, and F. dissiflora Griseb (1), furnish them with raw material of

1. Parodi, p. 4.

[text continues on p. 16]

/148 cont./

115 the former had had much more frequent contacts with the
191 neighboring populations.

114 Here I should note that Métraux's assertion in his 1937
191 work on the almost general usage of Aymara by the Uru of Iru-Itu, who "practically do not speak their old language any more," was clearly exaggerated. In 1938, alongside individuals who spoke Aymara fluently, numerous men knew only a few words
[199] of it, and most of the women did not know it at all. The only ordinary language in the village was Uru, but it is natural that in the course of a short stay with Aymara informants, a traveler would mainly have had contacts with natives who knew this language, which gives a false impression of the group as a whole.

114 Moreover, it is inexact to state that the Uru call their
199 language Bukina or Pukina. This information was also given to me in 1938, during my first trip, by a Uru who spoke Aymara and even a few words of Spanish, and I published it in a small work on the Uru ("Les Indiens Uru du Desaguadero /The Uru Indians of the Desaguadero/," Boletim do Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro, 1939, XIV-XVII, 303-319). During my second stay I had an explanation /149/ of this declaration made by several Uru. All asserted to me that they did not know who the Pukina were and did not know of any people with this name, but a "mister" had said to them that this was the name of their language. It is not difficult to recognize in this connection Posnansky's intervention, of which it would be easy to cite other examples of the same kind.

115 My informants were the following:

Manuel Inta, apparently a pure-blooded Uru, a great-grandfather, who was almost 90 years old at the time of our investigation judging from the events at which he had been
[197] present in his youth. A robust man, he was still capable of making the trip on foot from La Paz to Tiahuanaco, 90 kilometers, in two days in order to save the price of his passage by train or bus, which had nevertheless been paid for him in

/149 cont./

115 large part, and this to the great dismay of the respectable
[147] guardian of the ruins of Tiahuanaco who had accompanied him to La Paz and whose watchfulness he tricked in order to enter
[191] his village alone. A very limited knowledge of Aymara, none of Spanish or Keŝwa /Quechua/. An excellent informant.

Carlos Kispe, from 40 to 50 years old, one of the youngest men in the group. He displayed characteristics in his physical
[144] appearance which led one to suspect a certain degree of Aymara crossbreeding (see the 2nd note, on Physical Anthropology
[848] /p. 30/). Besides he was an illegitimate son, born of an un-
[191] known father. Much more enterprising than Manuel Inta, he spoke Aymara fluently, but neither Spanish nor Keŝwa. He had frequent contacts with the neighboring Aymara populations and, faced with the persistant drought, was thinking of leaving
[191] Iru-Itu to go live as a fisher at Guaki. He also proved to be an excellent informant, but his syntax was less pure and less varied than that of Manuel Inta and his vocabulary poorer and more mixed with Aymara; he did not use, or even did not know, a certain number of words used by his companion.

195 It is interesting to underline these differences in /150/
184 language between individuals of the same village, belonging to two different generations. They allow us to follow the rapid evolution of languages entrusted to oral tradition alone without any monument to establish them.

115 Outside these two principal informants, we utilized other inhabitants of the village, either for the general investigation or for word comparisons.

128 For each text we shall indicate the informant who pro-
191 vided it. These texts were gone over several times with the informant in order to obtain as exact a transcription as possible. Their translation was always checked in Aymara. Even so, in the course of the same text, considerable variations in pronunciation will be observed, which do not appear to follow any definite rule. They indicate a certain phonetic instability, more marked, of course, between different observers.